R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 019 665 AL 001 207

ON THE LITERARY LANGUAGE IN CHINA AND JAPAN. PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS, NUMBER V.

BY- KONRAD, N.I.

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS, WASHINGTON, D.C.
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

PUB DATE MAY 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.12 51P.

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGE RESEARCH, *WRITTEN LANGUAGE, *JAPANESE, *CHINESE, LANGUAGE USAGE, LANGUAGE ROLE, CULTURAL FACTORS, NATIONALISM, CULTURAL AWARENESS, LITERARY HISTORY, LANGUAGE STYLES, LANGUAGE STANDARDIZATION, PEKING, TOKYO,

ORIENTALISTS HAVE OBSERVED THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL "STANDARD" LANGUAGES OF CHINA AND JAPAN AS A GRADUAL REPLACEMENT OF THE OLD "WRITTEN-LITERARY" LANGUAGE BY THE "COLLOQUIAL" SPOKEN LANGUAGE. THE AUTHOR DEFINES "WRITTEN-LITERARY" LANGUAGE, CORRESPONDING TO "WEN-YEN" IN CHINESE AND "BUNGO" IN JAPANESE, AS BEING ANALOGOUS TO THE LATIN "LITTERAE" WHICH MEANS BOTH "LITERATURE" AND "LETTERS." THIS IS IN OPPOSITION TO "SPOKEN" OR "COLLOQUIAL" LANGUAGE (CORRESPONDING TO "PAI-HUA" IN CHINESE AND "KOGO" IN JAPANESE), WHICH IS DEFINED AS THAT LANGUAGE UNDERSTOOD BY THE LARGEST NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN A COUNTRY. IN JAPAN, THIS IS THE TOKYO REGION DIALECT, AND IN CHINA, THE PEKING REGION DIALECT. THAT THESE "COMMON" OR "PLAIN" DIALECTS SHOULD HAVE THUS CRYSTALLIZED RESULTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES OF LOCAL DIALECTS COMING TOGETHER IN COMMON ACTIVITIES--TOKYO AND PEKING BEING THE LARGEST POLITICAL, ECONOMICAL, AND CULTURAL CENTERS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES. A MOVEMENT FOR THE FORMATION OF A NEW LITERARY LANGUAGE BASED UPON COLLOQUIAL SPEECH BEGAN IN JAPAN IN THE 1870'S AND 1880'S AND IS KNOWN AS THE "GEMBUN-ITCHI" OR "UNITY OF WORD AND WRITING" MOVEMENT. A SIMILAR MOVEMENT IN CHINA, "WEN-HSUEH KO-MING" OR "LITERARY REVOLUTION," MAY BE SAID TO HAVE BEGUN IN EARNEST IN 1919. THESE LITERARY MOVEMENTS WERE CLOSELY AFFECTED BY SOCIO-POLITICAL CHANGES AND THE USE OF REALISM, IN THE COLLOQUIAL LANGUAGE, BY CONTEMPORARY WRITERS. THE AUTHOR DESCRIBES THE HISTORIES OF THE TWO LITERARY LANGUAGES AND POINTS OUT THAT THE PATHS TO THE ADOPTION OF NATIONAL LITERARY LANGUAGES IN CHINA AND JAPAN ARE DIFFERENT BUT "THE STUDENT OF THE WRITTEN-LITERARY LANGUAGES OF BOTH COUNTRIES HAS ALWAYS ASSOCIATED THE WRITTEN-LITERARY LANGUAGES WITH EVERYTHING OLD AND EVERYTHING HINDERING SOCIAL AND CULTURAL PROGRESS." THE DISCUSSION PRESENTED PLACES EMPHASIS ON SOCIAL AND POLITICAL FACTORS RATHER THAN ON THE LINGUISTIC CHANGES. THIS STUDY, TRANSLATED BY PHILIP DORFF OF THE CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS AND EDITED FOR CONTENT BY SAMUEL MARTIN OF YALE UNIVERSITY, ORIGINALLY APPEARED IN "VOPROSY FORMIROVANIJA I RAZVITIJA NACIONAL'NYX JAZYKOV," M.M. GUXMAN, EDITOR, MOSCOW, 1960. (AMM)

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS

1717 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS [redacted] MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY the Center for Applied Linguistics TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE [redacted] OWNER."

ED019665

PRELIMINARY TRANSLATIONS OF SELECTED WORKS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

M.M. GUXMAN (ed.) Voprosy formirovanija i razvitija nacional'nyx jazykov [Problems of the Formation and Development of National Languages], Moscow 1960.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Number V

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This project was supported in part by the National Science Foundation Grant NSF GS-325. The Center for Applied Linguistics reserves all rights applicable to these translations. Comments are invited and may be addressed to the Translators at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

May 1964

AL 001 207

ON THE LITERARY LANGUAGE IN CHINA AND JAPAN

By N.I. Konrad

Translated by Philip Dorff

In European works on the Chinese and Japanese languages the terms "literary language" and "written language" are widely used. Western European Sinologists and Japanologists use primarily the second term ("written language," "langue écrite," "Schriftsprache") while Russian specialists use primarily the first.

Both terms signify a phenomenon of language reality called wen-yen in China and bungo in Japan. These words are similar in both languages, not only in meaning and use but also in their component parts. The element yen in the Chinese word and go in the Japanese both signify 'language'. The root element wen in the Chinese word and the same element (in Japanese pronunciation bun) in the Japanese word signify both 'literature' and 'writing'; in this respect they are analogous to Latin litterae (meaning both 'literature' and 'letters'). Thus, the precise translation of the words wen-yen and bungo requires a term which would signify both meanings simultaneously. Such a term was not found in European languages, for which reason two freely interchangeable translations are used. In order that the conceptual unity signified by the Chinese and Japanese terms not escape the reader, we will hereafter render the terms wen-yen and bungo by the Russian expression pis'menno - literaturnyj jazyk ['written-literary language'].

In European studies of the Chinese and Japanese languages this written-literary language is always opposed to the jazyk razgovornyj ("spoken language", "colloquial language", "langue parlée", "Umgangssprache"). This latter term corresponds to Chinese pai-hua and Japanese kōgo. Etymologically, pai-hua signifies 'plain speech' and kōgo signifies 'oral speech'. We will hereafter use the Russian expression razgovornyj jazyk [spoken or colloquial language] as a translation of these terms. The first step in studying the language situation in these countries consists in stating the function of both languages in this situation.

Any Sinologist or Japanologist who observed Chinese and Japanese language practice during the first half of the twentieth century not only observed these

AL 001 207

phenomena, however, but also witnessed the clash of the above-mentioned tendencies. The written-literary language, which had earlier dominated official and business documents, journalism, and artistic literature, was gradually replaced by the colloquial language. In Japanese artistic literature it yielded rather quickly to the colloquial language in almost all types of prose and was retained for a while only in certain types of poetry. Retreating from scientific-popular literature, the written-literary language continued to be used in specialized scientific literature and also in some kinds of newspaper articles. The matter ended in a "compromise": the colloquial language "integrated" into its structure several elements of the written-literary language. Though the written-literary language had long reigned alone in official and business spheres, where everything was written according to its norms, from the text of the law to linen receipts, in the end it failed to prevail. The new Japanese constitution of 1945, created after the surrender, i.e. a document of the type which had always been created strictly according to the norms of the written-literary language, was written in the colloquial language.

Beginning in the second decade of the twentieth century, the same process also took place in China. As a result, the colloquial language was consolidated in all spheres which had been dominated by the written-literary language.

Thus, we see a second proposition from which the researcher concerned with the language situation in China and Japan in the last forty to fifty years must proceed: he must recognize the struggle of these two languages, the written-literary and the colloquial, a struggle in which the colloquial was on the offensive and as a result of which the written-literary language was finally forced to retreat from the front.

The struggle was not "academic". Both in China and in Japan, as the entire contemporary history of these countries proves, questions of language have more than once become the object of social attention. In Japan in the 1880's, i.e. at the time when there began a widespread movement for the introduction of the colloquial language into artistic literature and journalism, a fierce controversy arose over which of the existing verbal copulas in the language ("da", "desu", "de aru") should be used. And this controversy was conducted by neither scholars nor linguists; it was conducted by the foremost writers of the time, who had laid the foundations of the new

realistic literature, the most significant trend in the literature of Japan, which was fortifying itself on the road to capitalism. These were: Hasegawa Futabatei, Yamada Bimyō, Ozaki Koyō. The first stood on the left flank; he fought for the most colloquial copula da; the second represented the center, as it were: he suggested the copula desu as the more literary; the third, who represented the right wing, advocated the copula de aru, intermediate between the purely spoken language and the written-literary, i.e. equally admissable to both. Of course, it was not a matter of the copula itself as such: each copula was used with a definite stylistic vocabulary and with its special stylistic grammatical forms; generally speaking, each corresponded to a particular style of speech. Inasmuch as the literary norms of the national language were in the process of formation at that time in Japan, all these questions were of the greatest social significance. Subsequent history has shown how the question of the copula was finally solved: the copula desu became the norm; the copula da became a part of that speech which was free from "polite" conventions; the copula de aru (or de arimasu) became a feature of speech not addressed directly to an interlocutor. In recent years the question of which of the existing personal pronouns should be used has been ardently debated. Moreover, the debate left the public domain and entered government spheres. The Ministry of Education issued a resolution in which it recommended the use of certain personal pronouns. It is characteristic that only those pronouns were recommended which are considered the most "neutral" from the point of view of politeness or rudeness. It would be possible to cite many such examples. It is important to note one characteristic feature which is invariably present in such controversies over language problems: the object of attack has always been the written-literary language, characterized as "reactionary" and "feudal". In China the struggle for the exclusion of the written-literary language from artistic literature and journalism, which intensified in 1918-1919, was openly declared a "literary revolution".

The appearance of such appraisals was due to the fact that the struggle against the written-literary language was always attended by a new social upsurge, by a strengthening of the fight for the democratization of society and culture. Thus, the struggle against the written-literary language in artistic literature in Japan first began during the bourgeois-liberal movement of

the 1870's and 1880's when, after the revolution of 1868, the main transformations were in progress which opened the door to the strengthening of capitalism in Japan. The fight for the colloquial language in China arose in 1919 in precisely the same way in the atmosphere of the "Movement of the Fourth of May", as the widespread democratic movement begun at that time in China is traditionally called. The aim of this movement was the liquidation of the remains of feudalism in society and liberation from the yoke of foreign imperialism. The last wave (in time) of such a movement in Japan reached its peak after the defeat of Japanese imperialism and militarism of World War II when large masses of Japanese people joined the struggle for the introduction of democratic reforms. The last wave (in time) of this movement in China was one of the results of the victory of the revolution. Mao Tse-tung spoke about the implications of language problems in his speech "Against Banal Schemes in the Party" delivered at a meeting of workers' leaders in Yenan on February 8, 1942: "During the 'Movement of the Fourth of May' the bearers of new trends revolted against literature of wen-yen and spoke out in favor of literature in pai-hua, revolted against old dogmas, in defense of science and democracy, and in this respect they were completely right."[1] It is apparent from these words that the introduction of pai-hua, i.e. of the spoken language, into all spheres of language use was considered in the context of the development of science and democracy. From all that has been said, a third proposition is outlined from which the student of the written-literary languages in China and Japan must proceed: he must take into account the fact that the social consciousness of the progressive democratic layers of both countries has always associated the written-literary language with everything old, everything hindering social and cultural progress.

In order to thoroughly understand all these facts, the circumstance already indicated must be taken into account: in both Japan and China, the exclusion of the old written-literary languages from literary use and their replacement by the colloquial languages took place within the framework of the process of strengthening the common-national language in the social function of the language of a nation and establishing the literary norm of that national language. Therefore, the first matter which requires illumination is the national language problem in both countries. The juxtaposition

of the development profiles of the national languages of two peoples, the Chinese and the Japanese, will permit us to note several common regularities in this process and expose the features distinctive to each country. The very history of these people affords a possibility of understanding both the causes for the appearance of these national distinctive features and their essence.

As is well known, the histories of China and Japan were very different during the historical period when the Chinese and Japanese national languages were developing: the formation and development of the national language in Japan took place during the transformation of a feudal country into a capitalist one; the formation and development of the national language in China, however, took place during a delay in the development of capitalism in connection with the dependent position of the country and its enslavement by Western European and American imperialism. This state of affairs accounts for the relative protractedness of the preservation of feudal elements in the country. Later, however, after the victory of the Chinese people over foreign aggressors and over reactionary forces within the country, the development of the Chinese national language took place under the circumstances of the People's Republic, which were fundamentallly different from the circumstances to be observed in Japan, where the capitalist structure continues to prevail. A bourgeois nation was formed in Japan; in China, this process failed to be achieved at an opportune time. The development of a people's democracy in modern China created the foundation for the formation of the Chinese socialist nation. The above-mentioned features in the history of Japan and China in the initial stage of national language history and in the present stage of this history account also for the features of the process of national language development of each of these peoples.

As in the most recent history of Japanese, so in the most recent history of Chinese, one fact may be observed -- in the first somewhat earlier, in the second somewhat later -- which has the significance of a definite landmark in the histories of both languages. In the history of the Japanese language, this is the movement for gembun-itchi, literally: for 'unity of word and writing'. In the history of Chinese language this is the movement which received in China the name wen-hsüeh ko-ming 'literary revolution'. The movement for "unity of word and writing" in Japan appeared in the 1880's; the "literary revolution" in China belongs to the end of the 1910's and the

beginning of the 1920's and is connected in the main with the events of 1918-1919.

Let us take a close look at what constituted the content of these phenomena.

The movement for "unity of word and writing" in Japan in the 1880's was a fight for having writers write as they spoke; in other words, it was a fight for the use of the living spoken language in literature.

The "literary revolution" of 1918-1919 in China was also a fight for having writers write as they spoke, a fight for the formation of a literary language based upon colloquial speech. "We should not exhaust much strength and energy on studying an ancient, dead language; instead, it is necessary to use the modern living language,"[2] said Lu Hsün later in one of his appearances, elucidating the essence of the "literary revolution." It is apparent from his words that the foremost participants in the Chinese culture of those years viewed this "modern living language" -- pai-hua, as it was called, -- not simply as a "spoken language," the language of everyday use; for them it was a new literary language: "it is necessary to write in a simple, contemporary literary language, understandable to everyone -- pai-hua,"[3] -- Lu Hsün said in the same speech.

The movement for the "unity of word and writing" in Japan was started by the young writers of that time, who later became the founders of the bourgeois literature -- Yamada Bimyō and Hasegawa Futabatei. But they only expressed in a more definite form what was then thought and said by many of the representatives of contemporary literature, journalism, and science.

The "literary revolution" in China was proclaimed by journalists and scholars from the ranks of the progressives among the Chinese intelligentsia. Lu Hsün in the speech quoted above said that making the transition to the new literary language was tantamount to "forcing silent China to begin to speak," and further added: "such work was accomplished for the first time shortly before the 'movement of May 4'. This was the 'literary revolution'."[4] This revolution was carried out by a group of writers at the head of which stood Lu Hsün, who had become the founder of a new progressive artistic literature in China. Kuo Mo-jo, the second outstanding figure of the new literature immediately entered this group. These writers expressed themselves, however, only on those subjects which were on the minds and lips

of the foremost intelligentsia of China of those years, especially the numerous young students who were its most active part.

Both movements achieved complete success: the colloquial living language lay at the base of the language of artistic literature in Japan, and later in the language of journalism and science; the living colloquial language became the foundation of the new literary language also in China. "The modern literary language, pai-hua, gradually began to spread throughout the country, and, it is necessary to say, did not in general meet with great obstacles,"[5] Lu Hsün writes about this period. Thus, both movements, in Japan as well as China, had, as we see, one and the same goal: the large-scale introduction of a national language, imparting to it all the most important language functions and thereby making it a really universal instrument of communication in the given country, and, in addition, not only of oral communication, but of written communication as well. The fact that this goal was successfully (although not immediately) achieved testifies to the fact that it was set up by the very history of these two peoples.

In the movement for the transition of literature to the spoken language, two aspects must be distinguished: the theoretical foundation for the necessity of such a transition and the practical experience in the creation of works in the spoken language. In Japan, Maejima Mitsu, in his report to the shogun, Keiki, on a language and writing reform speaks about this transition in 1886, i.e. on the eve of the "revolution of Meiji." He addressed himself in 1869 to the new government with the same report. The movement greatly extended its scope in 1886 after the appearance of the treatise of Mozume Takami on Gembun-itchi. In the same year the first literary work written in the colloquial language appeared -- short sketches by Yamada Bimyō, then beginning his literary activity. In China the importance of the colloquial language was first spoken about in 1898, in the days of the so-called "reforms of K'ang Yu-wei." One of the participants in these reforms, Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, even attempted to publish an official gazette in pai-hua. But this attempt did not receive further development at the time and proved to be fruitless like all the reforms of K'ang Yu-wei. The movement for the new language did not actually develop until 1917-1919: at first it expressed itself in an appeal for such a transition and in its theoretical foundation. Several public figures, for example Hu Shih, wrote

about this in 1916. Beginning in 1917, the movement began to assume a broad character. The journal "Hsin Ch'ing-nien" became its organ, and its collaborators not only called for a transition of literature to the spoken language pai-hua, but themselves wrote in this tongue. Another journal, "Hsin Ch'ao," followed "Hsin Ch'ing-nien." Soon in many journals and newspapers special sections of articles and essays written in the colloquial language began to appear. The quickness with which this movement spread, immediately embracing not only literature but also journalism, is characteristic of China. This was not observed in Japan. In literature the main credit for introducing the spoken language into literature belongs to Lu Hsün, the founder of the New Chinese literature and the creator of its realistic bent. From this point of view, an important role was played by his early works: "K'uang-jen chi Chi" ('Notes of a Madman', 1919) and "Ah-Q Cheng-chuan" ('The True Story of Ah-Q', 1921).

What was the historical situation in both countries during the years when these movements appeared?

The Japan of the 1880's was a country which had just turned onto the road of capitalist development. In the not too distant past, in 1868-1871, there took place a "revolution and transformation" as V.I. Lenin characterized the events of those years in his "An Attempt to Synthesize the Main Facts of World History After 1870."[6] Inasmuch as this characterization is found in the section "Revolutionary Movements of a Non-proletarian Character" for the period 1870-1875, it is clear that V.I. Lenin had a bourgeois revolution in mind.

Indeed as early as the end of 1867 the house of Tokugawa was overthrown, a house which, for more than two and a half centuries, from the very beginning of the seventeenth century had governed the country and supported its feudal system in its last historical phase, sometimes called feudal absolutism. This event was revolutionary, entailing bourgeois transformations, transformations which are, as we know, partial, and left in the country a series of feudal institutions, but nevertheless as a whole led the country on the road of capitalist development along which it quickly traveled. The 1870's, i.e. the earliest years after the "Meiji revolution," as the revolution of 1867-1868 is usually called, were filled with these reforms, and opened for the Japanese bourgeoisie a broad path of development. The progressive elements among the bourgeoisie at the time led the struggle for reforms,

starting a "movement for the rights of the people" ('minken-undo'), as it was then called. The main slogan of the movement was "freedom" ('jiyū') in the limited sense that this slogan acquired among the bourgeoisie. In short, a bourgeois-liberal movement developed which is typical of the bourgeoisie in general in the period of struggle for the establishment of its dominance. In the middle of the 1880's the greatest upsurge in this movement appeared. It was precisely at this time that the movement for the "unity of word and writing" was begun.

The China of 1918-1919 was a country which had only a few years earlier experienced a revolution, as Mao Tse-tung termed the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty in 1911.[7] For more than two and a half centuries, from the middle of the seventeenth century, this dynasty ruled the country, establishing its supremacy, which was a specific form of feudal absolutism. The overthrow of the Manchu dynasty was a revolution, because the destruction of the Bogdo Kha[ga]n regime removed one of the most important obstacles in the path of the introduction even of the mainly bourgeois reforms into the country. The fact that this regime indeed was a hindrance is strikingly shown by the failure of K'ang Yu-wei, who in 1898 attempted to introduce such reforms under this regime. After the events of 1911 a struggle for democracy (in its bourgeois interpretation) began in the country, led by the Kuomintang Party, headed then by Sun Yat-sen, that "harbinger of the Chinese revolution," as he was called by Mao Tse-tung, which represented then the progressive strata of the Chinese bourgeoisie. But the revolution of 1911 was only one of the stages on the road to the liberation of China from feudalism and, moreover, from a semi-colonial state. The revolution of 1911 was still not a real struggle either with feudalism or with foreign imperialism. The protracted struggle began only in 1919 in the form of the "Movement of the Fourth of May," as the rise of the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist movement, which appeared under the direct influence of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, began to be called in China. The leading role in this upsurge was played by the revolutionary democrats, the best representative of whom was Lu Hsün.

This, in similar fact occurred in the modern history of Japan and China; there appeared a broad social movement for the introduction of the living colloquial language into literature and, moreover, into journalism and science, and for the literary cultivation of the living colloquial speech.

To the fighters for its dissemination, this language was kokugo in Japan, kuo-yü in China. These terms in both languages are understood both as the "language of the people" in the sense of the whole population of the country, and as a "common language," i.e. the "language of the nation" and as the "language of the government" formed by that nation. It is not difficult to see that all this, only different aspects of the same concept, is that which in our linguistics is signified by the expression "national literary language" or "literary norm of the national language."

The movement for the dissemination of the national literary language appeared after both countries, to one or another degree, had started on the road to bourgeois revolution, shortly after those elements of feudalism were overcome, which more than anything else hindered the development of capitalism; this movement displayed itself at the time of the highest peak of the progressive movement of the bourgeoisie in these countries, a movement which in each country assumed a special form, depending upon the specific type of historical development of these countries: a bourgeois, liberal movement in Japan, a bourgeois-democratic movement in China. Such are the historical facts.

A general feature of the development process of the national language of both countries displayed itself in the fact that both in China and in Japan the movement for the dissemination of the national language began at the time of the rise of a bourgeois movement, a movement which was progressive for its time. In Japan, however, it was connected with the bourgeois-liberal movement; in China with the bourgeois-democratic movement. This determined the essential national differences of the process: the bourgeois-democratic movement in China, as the more progressive, thus guaranteed the quicker and more decisive development and dissemination of the national literary language.

What was the language which in Japan and China began to be called national? Inasmuch as the goal of the above-mentioned movements was its dissemination, this was obviously an important question.

We already stated above that this was our contemporary living colloquial language in both countries. We know this on the basis of our own observations and on the basis of how the movement was named in both countries. In Japan it was called directly: a movement for the unity of the word, i.e. of oral speech, and writing, i.e. of written speech; in China they said: a fight for the simple language (pai-hua), i.e. the language which everyone spoke.

But what was the "colloquial language"?

A simple observation gives the answer: it was the language understood by the largest number of people, the most widespread. In Japan the inhabitants of Tokyo (in the eastern part of the island of Honshū) and the inhabitantants of Osaka (in the western part of the same island) understood one another in this language; it was understood in Nagasaki (on the southern island of Kyūshū) and in Hakodate (on the northern island of Hokkaidō). In China with pai-hua it was possible to live in Peking in the northern part of the country, in Nanking in the central part, and in Canton in the southern part. One could travel all around the country with it.

It is true that, in traveling around Japan and landing, say, in Osaka or Nagasaki, we heard a speech which we understood very poorly: this was a local dialect. The same situation was observed also in China. This was true in the cities and even more so in the villages: here it was often necessary to look for someone who spoke the Tokyo language, if our business was in Japan, or the Peking language, if our business was in China. Usually such a person turned out to be a local official or a school teacher. The peasants somehow understood the speech of the "capital," but answered our questions in such a way that we almost failed to understand anything. All this testifies to the fact that, together with the general language, local dialects also existed and exist even to this day.

But what was that language which was to a great extent common to the whole country? Was it a special language, standing, so to speak, above the dialects, or some type of dialect with a widespread distribution? What was just said gives us the answer: the common language in Japan was the language spoken in Tokyo; the common language in China was the language spoken in Peking.

Does it follow from this that the Peking dialect became the common language in China, and the Tokyo dialect the common language in Japan? In generl, yes, but with certain qualifications.

It may be asserted that it was the language which crystallized in Tokyo and Peking. But its base was broader than that of the urban sub-dialect: the base in Japan is the dialect of the whole vast region around Tokyo, i.e. the dialect of the eastern part of the island of Honshū; the base in China is the dialect of the whole vast region of which Peking is a part, i.e. the northern dialect of the Chinese language. But we repeat: this language

crystallized in Tokyo and Peking, the largest political, economical, and cultural centers in the country, where representatives from various parts of the country, i.e. representatives of the local dialects came together in common activities.

The latter may be proven by concrete historical facts. Let us consider Japan. Edo, as the capital of the country was called until 1868, now Tokyo, was where the families of all the feudal lords, great and small, lived until the second half of the seventeenth century; with them lived numerous domestic servants as well. Here were found princely vassals of various ranks, conducting all the important business in the government institutions. The feudal lords themselves periodically lived in Edo, always surrounded by their military entourages, in the case of important rulers always very numerous. As a result, the population of the capital was always very mixed. To this it is necessary to add the permanent presence in Edo of the representatives of the various commercial houses all over the country, especially from Osaka, Kyoto, and Nagasaki. The capital was the largest center of trade conducting business with all parts of the country. All these new arrivals, who had used their native speech at home, learned in Edo to use the speech of this city and, traveling later to their homes, carried this speech to all the corners of the country. Likewise, the natives of Edo themselves assimilated something from the alien, ever-changing population. There were especially lively relationships between the Edo merchant and the merchant houses of Osaka and Kyoto, and on the strength of such contacts elements from the dialects of these two cities in particular appeared in the language of the Edoities; in Osaka and Kyoto, more persistently than in other places, in turn, the speech of Edo appeared. Thus, the national literary language of Japan was formed in a situation where there was lively communication among the representatives of various local dialects in the dialect of the political and cultural center of the country, the city of Edo. This may be observed in a series of linguistic facts. We shall introduce only one of these facts. As early as the middle of the nineteenth century, in the language spoken in Edo, forms of the verbal conjugation were present which were characteristic of all the eastern Japanese dialects, i.e. of the dialect system to which the speech of this city belonged, and at the same time forms of conjugation were present which were characteristic of the western Japanese dialect system, in particular, of the speech of Osaka and Kyoto.

Both series of forms were, apparently, so vital that the English Japanologist B.H. Chamberlain presented them as two variants of the verb conjugation in his grammar of the Japanese language (understood as the common language of the entire country), compiled in the 1880's. At the end of the century, however, only isolated elements of the Western Japanese dialect forms of the verb conjugation remained in the Japanese national language, which, as indicated above, is supported by the fact that the Eastern Japanese dialect, represented by the speech of the city of Edo (Tokyo), formed the dialect base of the national literary language[8]. This common language, formed in the last period of Japanese feudalism, received its special designation in the language: it was called futsūgo, literally 'usual language,' i.e. found everywhere, in other words, 'common'.

How did this process go in China? From the thirteenth century on, Peking became the largest political, economic and cultural center of the country. Trade relations connected Peking with all the government districts. Peking trade houses conducted lively trade relations throughout the whole country, and large trading firms of the provinces also constantly did business with those of Peking. In a word, the picture was the same as that in Japan. Not only were there in Peking "princely courts," as in Edo, but there was something which did not exist in Edo: large numbers of youths from provincial noble families, especially from petty landowner families, were regularly situated in Peking. They traveled there from all parts of the country. It was they who strove to enter government service, and who formed the entire middle and lower, and in part also the upper stratum of officials, who were very numerous and influential in this enormous country with its centralized government.

In order to receive any position in the government structure, it was necessary to take a state examination. The examination for lower positions was given in the provincial centers of the countries; in order to receive the right to occupy a more important post, it was necessary to take the examination in the capital, Peking. Preparation for this examination was accompanied by a protracted stay in the Capital, which naturally demanded a knowledge of the language spoken in Peking. Thus, the youths, receiving assignments in all parts of the country, spread the Peking speech everywhere, thereby making it the language of government institutions. This language received its special designation in the country; kuan-hua, literally

'officialese'; the Portuguese, who were the first Europeans to encounter it, because they called all the officials of the "heavenly empire" mandarins, translated this Chinese name by the expression 'Mandarin Language', 'Mandarin Dialect'.

Not only officials spoke the Mandarin dialect; it was spoken by the educated classes of Chinese society of the time in general; this dialect spread even among the trading population of the country. In short, at the end of the nineteenth century, it had already become p'u-t'ung-hua 'usual language', as it began to be called; "usual language" in the same sense as futsūgo in Japan, i.e. "common language".

We have been speaking until now about that form of the common language which was created during the last epoch of feudalism--the period of feudal absolutism. In Japan this was the period of the Tokugawa shogunate, i.e. the beginning of the seventeenth to the middle of the nineteenth century, in China, the period of the Ch'ing Empire, i.e. the middle of the seventeenth to the beginning of the twentieth century. It would be erroneous to think, however, that the dialects--the Eastern Japanese represented in the dialect of the city of Edo, the Northern Chinese represented in the dialect of the city of Peking, lying at the foundation of the national literary languages of these two peoples, were formed in the same historical period.

Already in the second half of the sixteenth century we observe in Japan the main features of this dialect, the beginning of the formation of which dates back to still remoter times. This is not to be understood as the Edo dialect proper, because, in the strict sense of the word, this dialect may be spoken of only with the appearance of the city of Edo itself, i.e. from the beginning of the seventeenth century; rather, as the Japanese language as a whole: beginning with the second half of the fourteenth century the features of the grammatical structure which is characteristic of contemporary Japanese may be clearly observed: in the second half of the sixteenth century and beginning of the seventeenth century the contemporary phonetic system was basically formed. However, in connection with the fact that this developing, common Japanese norm later underwent special development within the city of Edo, one must speak of an Edo dialect.[10] The end of the seventeenth century and especially the eighteenth century are merely periods in

the development of this dialect and its diffusion throughout the country, to some extent as a common language.

In China, the northern dialect began to acquire its characteristics, as we know them today, as early as the eighteenth century.[11] Its sources, however, date back to much earlier times. Phonetically, the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when the main features of its later phonetic cast were worked out, are of great significance in its history. Therefore, only the subsequent development of this dialect and its diffusion throughout the country, to some extent as a common language, belongs to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

It is necessary, however, to make one addition to the above exposition. We spoke about the diffusion of the Eastern Japanese dialect throughout Japan and of the Northern Chinese dialect throughout China, and about their acquiring the significance of a common national language. It should be added that the possibility for such a diffusion was facilitated by the process of a certain concentration of dialects, in progress at that time, a concentration, it is true, which did not then have a common character, and was restricted to the spheres of definite groups of local dialects, but which nevertheless, despite this restrictedness, had developed features of the future unified national norm. Thus, in Japan, at the end of the sixteenth century and at the beginning of the seventeenth we observe the traces of the common koiné in each of the two most important dialect systems -- the Western Japanese and the Eastern Japanese, the Kansai and the Kantō, as they are called in Japan. Phonetically, as was already stated, the phonetic system which is characteristic of the contemporary literary norm of the national language was established as far as its most important elements are concerned, from the sixteenth century on.

In China we detect the formation of a koiné in each of the most important groups of dialects at an early date: in a group of northern dialects, in a group of dialects of the eastern part of China -- the Min group, as it is called in China, in another group of eastern dialects, the Wu group, and in a group of southeastern dialects -- the Yüeh group.[12] The presence of such local koinés with the ever increasing communication between people from different districts facilitated the general process of dialect concentration. It was precisely this common linguistic ground

which facilitated the diffusion of the Edo dialect in Japan and the Peking dialect in China as the common language of the country.

It is necessary to note one further circumstance. When we trace the history of the common language, that predecessor of the unified national literary language, we find it, naturally, in literary works of some sort. In the main, these are literary works created by the bourgeoisie, who were born still within the framework of a feudal society. We stated above that in Japan the main features of the future common language are found in the fourteenth century. They can be observed in the language of the first works of early urban literature, the farces (kyōgen).[13] It was said above, that we can detect the formation of elements of the future common language in China in the thirteenth century. Where do we find it? In the narrative literature of the time. But such literature was created by the urban classes of the time. Thus, the turn taken by a dialect in the direction of gradual transformation into a common language is connected with the growth of the bourgeois elements.

Needless to say, this did not mean that the bourgeoisie used some sort of "special" language of its own. This language was the common language in the dialect system of a region which, as a result of general historical principles, acquired special significance in the country. Usually this was the region of its main political, economic, and cultural center. The language was created by the whole population of this region, the bourgeoisie playing an essential role in its literary reenforcement and its diffusion. But this shows the significance of growing capitalist relationships in the unfolding and development of a common language, later developing into a national literary language.

Thus, the Edo dialect in Japan and the Peking dialect in China became the foundation on which the common national languages, which received the name "ordinary languages", developed in both countries during the feudal state: futsūgo -- 'ordinary language' in Japan and p'u-t'ung-hua -- 'ordinary language' in China. But we cannot speak of the development of 'ordinary languages' into national languages at that time: they were not yet either kokugo nor kuo-yü -- 'national languages'.

Should this be understood in the sense that the national language which we now know in Japan and China constitutes something else compared

with the "ordinary language"? The answer to this question must be double: both yes and no.

The national language in twentieth century China and Japan is not different from the "ordinary language" of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries in these countries; it does not constitute something different either in the sense of its grammatical structure or in the sense of its basic vocabulary stock. Both the basic vocabulary stock, i.e. above all, the everyday lexicon, and the grammatical structure of the national languages of these countries are the same as those of the "ordinary language" of their past. The concept of "national language" is not a concept of particular grammatical structure or particular lexical stock.

Where is it necessary to seek the difference between "national language" and "ordinary language"? Perhaps only in the fact that the "ordinary language" became the national language only as a result of the development and perfection of its own elements?

Of course the contemporary national languages in China and Japan have widely diverged from the "ordinary languages" of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The lexical structure changed in the most radical way. Japan, which turned toward capitalism in the middle of the nineteenth century, took over the technology of Europe and America as well as the exact and natural sciences with which this technology is connected; the bourgeoisie demanded the founding of political and juridical institutions, which were connected with that portion of the social sciences which catered to a capitalist basis.[14] It is natural that all this entailed the introduction of an enormous number of new words and expressions into the vocabulary of the language. The same enrichment of the vocabulary is to be observed in the last forty to fifty years in China. It is true that here, in comparison with Japan, there were peculiarities in this process in connection with the delayed and ugly development of capitalism in the country (ugly because of the semi-colonial position of the country and the stubborn persistence of feudalism). Building a new type of industry on a new technology in China was extremely slow and inadequate. Therefore, the new technology and the exact sciences connected with it could not be introduced in their entirety and therefore, the expansion of the vocabulary with new terms coming from this sphere was not abundant and stable. Instead of this

there was a great enrichment of the language by new words and expressions coming from the realm of the social sciences. In China, as is known, feudalism and the yoke of imperialism long constituted the main obstacle to the development of the Chinese people, as a result of which a bitter struggle began in China with internal feudal and external imperialist oppression, a struggle in need of an effective ideological weapon. A revolutionary-democratic movement, whose leader was Sun Yat-sen, quickly developed in China, and later grew into a struggle headed by the Communist party, a struggle in which Marxism-Leninism became a powerful ideological weapon.[15] All this led to the entrance into the vocabulary of the Chinese national language of an enormous number of new words and expressions from the social sciences, developing on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology.

Thus, the active vocabulary of the modern Japanese and Chinese languages is not the vocabulary which was characteristic of the "ordinary languages" of these countries in the recent past. But this change in the vocabulary was above all quantitative. It is true that a few changes in the morphology of derivation took place, precisely in connection with these new words, for example, the appearance of a series of new derivational affixes, but these changes do not alter the principal characteristics of the morphology of derivation in the Chinese and Japanese languages in general. Certain new phenomena in the grammatical structure as, for example, the wide development in Japanese of constructions with the predicate in the passive voice with a non-animate subject, as well as the diffusion of grammatical calques from European languages into Chinese, also do not change the base of this grammatical structure and they moreover are based on certain phenomena observed in the structure of the language in the past. Consequently, neither in changes in the vocabulary nor in changes in the grammatical structure should the appearance of the development of "ordinary languages" in Chin and Japan into national languages be sought. What, then, changed futsūgo and p'u-t'ung-hua into kokugo and kuo-yü?

It would seem that the answer to this question is clear: the conversion of these "ordinary languages" from folk languages into national languages. Of course, this is so. But nations began to be formed in Japan and China relatively recently. J.V. Stalin shows that nationalities develop into

nations "with the appearance of capitalism, with the liquidation of feudal division and the formation of a national market".[16]

Attention should be paid to the fact that J.V.Stalin is not speaking here about the complete liquidation of the feudal structure, but only about the liquidation of feudal division. This means that under centralized feudalism the formation of a nation, at least the beginning of such a formation, is possible. Of course this possibility comes about not only as the result of the liquidation of feudal division; for this, two more conditions are necessary: the appearance of capitalism and the formation of a national market. But we know that capitalist relations arise under feudalism, that a national market begins to be created then also. As history shows, all this takes place in the last phase of feudalism, in the period of absolutism. The period of the Tokugawa shogunate was precisely such a period in Japan (the beginning of the seventeenth to the middle of the nineteenth centuries), and in China it was the period of the Ch'ing Empire (the middle of the seventeenth to the beginning of the twentieth centuries). Consequently, the process of national formation in these countries had already appeared at that time.

It is known that the development of a nationality into a nation is accompanied by the development of a nationality language into a national language. From this it follows that the appearance of the "ordinary language" in these countries meant that a national language had already arisen.

A national language, in the full sense of the word, is formed later when it wins for itself the place of a unified common national language for the whole country. This process is connected in Japan with the above-mentioned movement for "the unity of speech and writing", in China with the "literary revolution". What did these movements mean? The struggle for the possession of all spheres of linguistic communication. The successful result of this struggle, i.e. the conquest of all spheres of linguistic communication, would mean the ultimate formation of the national language.

The historical period in which this struggle flared up has already been stated above. In Japan this was during the 1880's, after the overthrow of the shogunate and the introduction of bourgeois reforms, during the years when the bourgeoisie was actively working to strengthen its positions and pave the way for the development of capitalism. In China

this was from 1917 to 1919, i.e. after the revolution of 1911, which overthrew the Bogdo Kha[ga]n regime and established a republic. Before 1919, and the above-mentioned "Movement of the Fourth of May", the "literary revolution" was part of a general struggle on the cultural front, and this struggle was, as it is characterized by Mao Tse-tung, "a stuggle between the new bourgeois culture and the old feudal culture".[17] Thus, in China too, the struggle of the national language to conquer all spheres of linguistic communication, i.e. to definitively strengthen its position precisely as a national language, also unfolded after the first victories of the bourgeoisie over feudalism.

As was already stated above, however, the cardinal difference between the movements of the 1880's in Japan and the "Movement of the Fourth of May", 1919, in China, must be taken into consideration.

In Japan, this struggle was only for the main bourgeois reforms; in China, however, as we see from all the subsequent events, this movement, joined to the struggle for national liberation, quickly stirred up all the Chinese people and led to a struggle for the interests of the broad masses of people; in short, the struggle assumed a broad revolutionary scope. In Japan this struggle led to the surrender by the bourgeoisie of its bourgeois-liberal position and to the formation of a reactionary bourgeois-landowner block. In China, after joining the movement for national liberation, it quickly seized the main classes of the Chinese people and led to the Communist party's heading the struggle, which determined the real revolutionary character of the whole movement. In connection with this, the colloquial language in China, more quickly and surely than in Japan, occupied its position in the literary norm of the national language.

It was stated above that this struggle was above all for the mastery of artistic literature. This circumstance is of great and special interest to the investigator of the history of national languages. Why was there a struggle for the language of artistic literature? Because the paramount importance of this domain was consciously or unconsciously understood. Because literature plays the most important role in the formation of a man's personality, his thoughts, his feelings, and his emotions. The influence of literature on man is exceedingly wide and multifaceted.

It is necessary to note that the full affirmation of the national language in the literature of Japan and China is connected with the development

of realism in this literature. Only realistic literature, definitively established in Japan at the end of the past century and the beginning of the present one and in China at the end of the second decade of the twentieth century, introduced the spoken language into the literature.

Thus, the first stage of this struggle was primarily for the language of literature. In Japan one thus spoke of the struggle for the "unity of speech and writing"; the "literary revolution" in China was fought under the slogan of the transition of literature of pai-hua, the "simple language". Thus, the struggle for the language was at the same time a struggle for a new content and method in literature. But what did the new literary language have to contend with in its struggle for affirmation? Any Japanese and any Chinese language specialist can answer this question: with the old literary language, with the literary language of feudal Japan and China.

Mao Tze-tung speaks very eloquently about this with respect to China. Characterizing the ideological side of the "Movement of the Fourth of May" (1919), he indicates that it was directed against old dogmas. By "old dogmas" he meant the Confucian doctrines in which the representatives of the ruling class of former times were raised. These doctrines were reflected in the literature in wen-yen wen, i.e. in the various types of compositions (wen) written in the old literary language (wen-yen). This old literary language, the literary language of the eighth to thirteenth centuries, was in the eyes of the 'new people", as the participants in this movement are called by Mao Tse-tung, an embodiment so to speak, of the Old Confucian doctrines, in other words, of the ideology of the old ruling class which still retained its position. For this reason, by opposing "science and democracy" to these doctrines, the "new people" displayed as their banner pai-hua wen, 'literature written in pai-hua', in the new literary language, in the literary language of the twentieth century. They thought that the new ideas of science and democracy could and should be expressed by means of this language.[18] The greatest classicist of the realistic novel in Japan, Shimazaki Tōson (1872-1943) speaks of the need for the new literature to tear itself away from the paths of the old literary language. In a special introduction written by him for the Russian translation of his novel The Broken Precept, he writes: "I would like to direct attention...to the fact that our new literature already has a forty-year history behind it. I would like it to be kept in mind that this new

literature began with a movement for the unification of the spoken and bookish languages. Until that time our language was so restricted by special and restrictive laws and rules that the writing of a literary work of art in the same language as that used in life was not permitted. This movement freed our literature from all the ways of the past. I consider this to be one of the most important points for understanding the appearance and development of our new literature."[19]

We cannot go into a detailed explanation here of the question of what this old literary language was, its nature, or its history. We will only say here that this language at the time of its growth was the living, colloquial language of the time, and that it gradually froze in certain forms, departing, as a result, from the constantly developing colloquial language; that it turned into a written language, almost unintelligible when heard, in the last centuries in both Japan and China. And it was called "written language", wen-yen in China and bungo in Japan.

It was this written literary language of old feudal China and feudal Japan with which the spoken language entered into conflict. As was said above, the battlefront quickly widened: the colloquial language began its attack not only in artistic literature but in all spheres dominated by the old written-literary language, above all in the spheres of journalism and science.

Here it is necessary to note an essential difference between what happened in China and what happened in Japan. In Japan the introduction of the new literary language into journalism and science took place much more slowly than in China. It is sufficient to say that up until recent times in Japan, not only editorials in newspapers but telegrams as well were written in a language which preserved the main features of the old literary language. For a long time also scientific works were written in this old literary language. In China, however, journalism and science were conquered by the new literary language much more quickly and decisively.

One characteristic of the struggle should be mentioned. The fighters for the universal introduction of the "ordinary" language, striving by every means to undermine the position of the old literary language, did not stop at declaring it "class hostile". In China, this manifested itself in the occasional association of wen-yen, i.e. of the old literary language of China, with feudalism. In Japan, the same tendency was marked in the

discussion of the democratization of the national language, a discussion which arose soon after the defeat of Japanese imperialism in the Second World War.[20]

What was understood by "class" in language?

Essentially, the matter did not concern language as such but that social class which cultivated the old literary language, already the written-literary to the new generation, i.e. understood with difficulty when heard. Indeed, this class was raised in the old tradition, received its education on the old foundation, looked scornfully upon the colloquial language, considering it inadmissible to turn to it either in business or in "serious" literature -- poetry and essays. The colloquial language, from the point of view of this stratum was a language to "peasant" novels, the property of the "ignorant mob". In reality, such views were inherited from feudal times and were justifiably evaluated by the new generation as "feudal", and this evaluation carried over to the literary language used by those who held the above-mentioned views. The severity of such an evaluation was a result of the political opinions of the overwhelming majority of people in this class: they were at best conservative, and at worst completely reactionary. In this connection, what came from the pens of these writers was for the people of the new generation not only "backward" but hostile, "feudal", as they said.

Thus, the character of such a social class, which stood for the old literary language, the political positions of this c lass and the content of that which was created in this class, i.e. those features which really were of a class nature, were carried over to the language itself. If one turns to that which was found of a "class" nature, directly "feudal" in the language itself, this turns out to be, in essence, a few words and expressions characteristic of a speech style of a certain portion of the nobility and bourgeoisie, words and expressions which had permeated the common language. In the majority of cases, these words and expressions belong to the category of so-called "politeness formulas", i.e. words and expressions especially suited for stressing the modesty of the speaker in relation to himself and his deference toward either his interlocutor or the person spoken about. The mistake of the partisans of democratization lay in the fact that they imparted to these words and expressions excessive

significance, not understanding that words and expressions coming from the jargons of several social levels do not completely transform a language into a class language.

In the final analysis, it must be mentioned that the struggle for the new literary language led to its victory, inasmuch as this struggle was predestined by history itself. But only in the final analysis, i.e. far from immediately.

The complete victory of the new literary language in artistic literature, i.e. the elimination of the old literary language, came in Japan only in the first decade of our century, in the third decade in China. We can explain why this happened just at that time. In Japan, in the middle of the first decade, there unfolded a wide spread bourgeois-democratic movement known under the name of Heimin-undō 'the movement of simple people'. This movement was evoked by the protest of the masses against a bourgeoisie which had turned into a reactionary force and, forming a bloc with the landowners, hindered the further democratization of the country. The sharpness of this movement no doubt also reflected the protest of the masses against war with Russia and to a large extent the revolutionary movement of 1905 in Russia.

The above-mentioned "Movement of the Fourth of May" broke out in China in 1919. Its substance and consequences were characterized by Mao Tse-tung in the following fashion: "Until the fourth of May, Chinese literature was old-democractic in character and constituted a part of the world bourgeois-capitalist cultural revolution. After the fourth of May, the new Chinese culture became new-democratic in character and constituted a part of the world proletarian-socialist cultural revolution".[21]

There is no doubt that such a change could not have occurred had it not been for what Mao Tse-tung here calls "the world proletarian-socialist cultural revolution". To the extent that the revolution occurred in Russia, the change in the social foundation of the national liberation movement in China was influenced by the Great October Socialist Revolution. It thus becomes clear why the final consolidation of the position of the "ordinary" language as the national literary language in Japan and in China occurred at the indicated time: only the new surge in the people's movement in the struggle against reaction could create the conditions for such a victory.

After the victory of the new democracy in China, the new literary language not only dominated artistic literature but all the other spheres of language use as well. In Japan, however, even after the elimination of the old written-literary language from artistic literature, this language continued for a while to maintain its position in other spheres: completely in the sphere of official documentation, partly in journalism. This position was defeated only under the new upsurge of the democratic movement after the Second World War.

As a consequence of the introduction of the new literary language into literature, literature immediately became the main arena for the further development of the national literary language. Moreover, it became the soil in which the common national language norm grew. This means that the literary languages of China and Japan were formed within the framework of the national language. As distinct from the old literary language, which had formed already in feudal Japan and feudal China, we call it the new literary language. In Japan, where it began to develop comparatively early, during the 1880's, it received a special designation: it is called Hyōjungo 'normative language' or 'standard language', as the Japanese name is translated. It was given such a name precisely because it had become the language norm to which all the local dialects and sub-dialects and all oral and written speech in general were standardized. The school became the most important channel for the dissemination of this literary language, or language norm, especially the elementary school which was assigned the task of cultivating this norm in the whole population of the country.

The new literary language in China was originally designated by the same word pai-hua, which had served as the designation for the colloquial language; it later began to be called kuo-yü, literally 'state language' -- the same word which was used to designate what we call "national literary language". In China too the school became the most important means for the dissemination of this new literary language.

Thus, the paths leading to the establishment of the literary norm of the national language, in other words, the paths leading to the formation of the new, modern literary language in China and Japan are very complex and in many respects different in each of these two countries; the relationship of the new literary language to the old in each of these countries is complex and also different. The new literary language in Japan absorbed

many more elements from the old literary language, mostly in the realm of the various language styles; in China, however, a greater divergence from the old literary language took place, even in the realm of language styles. Differences are also to be found in the relationship of the new literary language to the local dialects: the process of eliminating local dialects took place faster in Japan than in China, where dialects, sometimes encompassing very large territories with many millions of people, succeeded in forming their local koiné. In this connection, the process of channeling dialects into the main stream of the national language proceeds more slowly and with greater difficulty.

What is the difference in these countries between the old literary language and the new?

The "Chrestomathy" (Tokuhon) serves as the main textbook for native-language study in the Japanese elementary school. This chrestomathy is a collection of specially compiled or particularly selected texts intended to serve as models of the Japanese language. The language of these texts is that spoken by teachers and students, i.e. the colloquial language. It must be added, however, that this language may not completely correspond with that spoken in several localities of Japan by pupils and even teachers at home with their family, especially if the family is from the peasantry. The "domestic" language may be a local dialect, but the language spoken in school is studied across the country, understood by everyone, and is the language in which literary works are written.

In those sections of the chrestomathy which are studied in the higher grades, one or two phrases are sometimes given from the usual text in two varieties: in the variety in which the phrase is given in the text, i.e. in the spoken variety, and in the variety it should assume in the written-literary language. We will introduce an example of such a juxtaposition (where the upper line is the colloquial variety, the middle line the written-literary variety, and the lower line the meaning of each word); in English translation this sentence reads: "In the city of Osaka of the goods purchased abroad rice is the most numerous".

Osaka	shide	gaikokukara	kaiireru	shinamonowa
Osaka	shinite	gaikokuyori	kaiiruru	shinamonowa
'Osaka	in the city	abroad	purchased	goods

komega	ichiban	ōi
kome	mottomo	ōsi
rice	most	numerous'[22]

The student learns from such a juxtaposition that nouns in the locative case end in -de (shide 'in the city') in the spoken language, but in -nite (shinite) in the written-literary language, that the ablate case in the colloquial language ends in -kara (gaikokugara '(from) abroad') but in -yori (gaikokuyori) in the literary language; that the nominative case in one instance ends in -ga (komega 'rice') but has the form of the base (kome) in the other; that the attributive (participial) form of the verb kaiireru 'to buy' is kaiireru in the colloquial language, but kaiiruru in the written-literary language; that the predicative form of the adjective ōi 'numerous' is ōi in one instance but ōsi in the other; finally, that the word ichiban 'very, most' is best replaced by the word mottomo in the written-literary variety. The student thus sees that in the colloquial and written-literary varieties of the language certain case-endings, certain conjugated forms of the verb and adjective and even certain words are different.

Although relatively limited in the Japanese elementary school, in the secondary school the study of the written-literary language is widespread. A large number of model texts of this language were included in the chrestomathy. The wide divergence between the spoken and written-literary languages may be seen from the fact that a special course in the grammar of the writte-literary language is necessary. The amount of lexical divergence may be judged even by such an example as the following: when translating the phrase

saihai	janzen	betsujini	zokuseri
'success and failure	clearly	to different things	belong'

into the colloquial language, the one word saihai must be replaced by the two words seikō and shippai; the word hanzen by the word hakkirito, the word betsujini by the phrase betsuno kotoni, the verb zokuseri by the verb natteiru; not only is a new word selected in the latter case, but a different aspect of a semantically identical verbal form.[23]

In China, too, a chrestomathy is the main textbook for native language study. In many chrestomathies intended for use in the secondary school, two textual varieties are given at once: an original variety in the written-literary language and a translated variety in the colloquial. We will cite an example with the following English translation: 'Once all the foxes ran out of food, and they gathered together to go into the field and seek food.'[24]

Original text:

i jih ch'üan hu shih chüeh chiang ch'u
'one day many (all) foxes, food ran out gathered together to go
yeh ch'iu shih
field to seek food'

Translation into the spoken language:

yu i-t'ien hsü-to hu-li liang-shih wan-le t'a-men pien-hsiang
'there were once many(all) foxes provisions ran out they planned
ch'u wai hsün yeh-shih
to go out to seek fodder'

From the juxtaposition of these two varieties, the Chinese school boy sees that almost all the words in the written-literary language are ones he is unaccustomed to using: two words i jih, are used instead of the usual i-t'ien 'once'; ch'üan instead of hsü-to 'all, many'; hu instead of hu-li 'foxes'; shih instead of liang-shih 'provisions'; chüeh instead of wan-le 'ran out'; ch'iu instead of hsün 'to seek'; shih instead of yeh-shih 'fodder'. The Chinese school boy sees that certain grammatical forms are also different in the written-literary language. The form of the perfective aspect of the verb, ending in -le in the colloquial language, retains the base form in the written-literary language. The phrase-structure is also somewhat different: the word yu 'is' is unnecessary, while mandatory here in the colloquial language; the pronoun t'a-men, 'they' is also unnecessary.

The Chinese school boy sees from another example, kuo yeh chih fei i-erh jen chih kuo 'the state is not a state of one or two people,' that the written-literary kuo corresponds to the colloquial word kuo-chia 'state'; that where there are two words in the colloquial language, the negation pu 'not' and the copula shih 'is', the one word fei is used in the written-literary language as a special negative copula.[25] In short, the student becomes convinced that the compilers of the chrestomathy acted

rightly when they called the colloquial variety "a translation into the colloquial language".

The examples cited are sufficient to give those ignorant of Chinese and Japanese a certain conception of what the difference is between the written-literary and colloquial languages, and of the extent of the difference. The written-literary language has its own vocabulary, a significant part of which does not correspond to the vocabulary of the colloquial language (even as far as "common words" are concerned); the written language also has its own grammar, differing in many respects from the grammar of the colloquial language.

What is this written-literary language? Or, in other words, the old literary language of Japan and China?

The old literary language (simply "literary language" in former times, "written-literary language" in modern times) is studied according to models. These models are taken from both the works of the authors of the modern and even the most modern times, as well as from the literary monuments of former eras. This is explained by the fact that such journalists and social figures as, for example, Shimada Saburo (1852-1923) in Japan and Liang Ch-ch'ao (1874-1930) in China, phrases from whose works we cited above, reproduced the norms of the old language in their works.

Naturally, the vocabulary of the texts of various epochs may far from correspond. It would be strange to expect articles on voting law or a trade-union movement, studies of differential calculus or rates of exchange to be based on the old lexicon. Here, the language of the writings of Sun Yat-sen is very characteristic: its grammatical structure is typical wen-yen, written-literary language; its lexicon is that of spoken modern Chinese.

However, the extent to which any work uses the colloquial vocabulary is, in the main, restricted by the limits of the special lexicon, and the corresponding terminology; as far as "general" words are concerned, norms of the old language, even in the sphere of vocabulary, appear in force.

What was that old literary language? To which period does it belong?

When one studies the Japanese school texts containing models of the old language, one is struck by the frequent reference of the compilers to the Tsurezuregusa, one of the very famous monuments of fourteenth century literature. This is a collection of short essays, notes, and discussions

on all possible themes, from life, history, philosophy, etc. This book belongs to a poet-wanderer, the monk Kaneyoshi, better known under the monastic name Kenkō-hōshi. The language of this work serves as a model of the written-literary work.

The book of Kenkō-hōshi is not uniform in language: in this respect it is indicative of all Japanese literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. After Tsurezuregusa, more frequently than other monuments of literature in similar chrestomathies, one finds the historical naarrative Masu-kagami, also dating from the fourteenth century, and Hojōki, an autobiographical tale of the beginning of the thirteenth century. Thus, the historical form or model of the written-literary language of Japan of the modern and most recent periods is the language of the above-mentioned literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

The language of the "eight great writers of T'ang and Sung", i.e. of the esteemed poets, journalists, and historians of the T'ang and Sung dynasty serves as a similar historical model for the written-literary language of modern China. Generally accorded first place among them are Han Yü (768-823), Liu Tsung-yüan (733-829), Ou-yang Hsiu (1007-1072) and Su Shih (1063-1101). The works of these writers have long served as material for the study of the written-literary language, since the second half of the sixteenth century, when a well-known litterateur of the period, Mao K'un, published A Collection of Selected Works of the Eight Great Writers of T'ang and Sung with his comments. A completely educational application of the works of these writers appeared in the first half of the eighteenth century with the publication of A Chrestomathy from the Works of the Eight Great Writers of T'ang and Sung compiled by Shen Te-chiang. The extent to which the language of these writers served as a model for the writers of subsequent times may be judged from the words of Lu Hsün, who, speaking about the writers of the second half of the nineteenth century and even the beginning of the twentieth, said that "they reflected if not Han Yü, then Su Shih.[26] Here Lu Hsün had in mind not so much the content as the language. Thus, the historical model of the writte-literary language of China of the modern period and the latest period is the language of the works of the above-mentioned writers of the eighth to twelfth centuries.

What made the language of the literature of an earlier historical period a classical written-literary language in the eyes of succeeding generations? An answer to this question is given by the history of the language.

The history of the Japanese literary language -- in the form in which it is reflected in the monuments which have come down to us since the eighth century -- testifies to the fact that this language followed a peculiar path of development.

The rigid norms of the literary language, already formed in the eighth to twelfth centuries, were maintained in Japanese literature until the twentieth century. However, the living colloquial language, in developing its phonetic, lexical and grammatical systems, fought a stubborn battle with the archaic forms of writing for centuries and, in the end, almost completely eliminated them from all styles of written-literary speech. Examples were cited above of the written-literary and colloquial variants of one and the same text. The lexical and grammatical differences between these two variants are corresponding systemic differences.

It is not possible to go into a detailed description of each of these systems here. We shall elucidate what has been said only in the most general form, citing examples from one of the most important branches of grammar, the system of verbs and adjectives.

One phenomenon has remained stable throughout the history of the Japanese language: the presence of a set of common grammatical features in the verb and adjective. These common features are the presence in both the verb and adjective of predicative, attributive, and modifying forms; the ability of the verb and adjective to have tense and modal forms. Naturally, the external expression of these grammatical forms in the verb and adjective are different, and not all these forms are equally developed; moreover, both the verb and adjective have their special grammatical forms, inherent to each of them. For this reason, they do not coalesce into one lexico-grammatical category. At the same time, however, the presence of these general features does not permit their complete separation.

Thus, the general grammatical character of the verb and adjective remains unaltered throughout the duration of the history of the Japanese language, but the external expression of certain forms, the degree of their development, as well as their system itself changes. So, in the old language the system of verbal conjugation is based on a special form for each function of the verb in the sentence. The opposition there of predicative and attributive forms determined the inclusion of a participal in the system of verbal forms. In the modern language this opposition

disappeared, and consequently the grounds disappeared for separation of the participal, and that, in turn, influenced the structure of the attributive sentence. Modality in the old language developed in a system of moods; in the modern language these forms not only changed externally, but, more importantly, several aspects of modality were completely dropped from the system of grammatical modality, thus destroying the former system.

Even such examples as the following give the reader an idea of how different the grammatical forms are in the old and the modern languages.

The past tense in the old language had two forms; for example, from the verb toru 'to take' these forms are: toriki and toritariki. In the modern language the past tense (indicative mood) has only the one form totta. The future tense form in the old language is toran (toramu), and torō in the modern language. The negative forms of the verb in the old language are formed by means of the conjugated suffix -ji, by means of -nai in the modern language, so that 'I am not taking' is torazu in the old language but toranai in the modern language; 'I did not take' is torazariki in the old language, but toranakatta in the modern language. The predicative form of the adjective of the old language had the ending -shi, the attributive form, the ending -ki; in the modern language both these forms are identical and take the -i.

Naturally such changes have arisen and developed gradually in the history of the Japanese language; moreover, the changes did not affect the whole of the language, but appeared at different times and in different places. During the course of a long period of time, two forms, the former and the new, usually coexisted; sometimes the new form was not retained and the old form again established itself in full force.

Thus, for example, the old system of verbal conjugation was formed over the course of a protracted period of time (several centuries) during which it gradually changed into a new system and in this new system itself were deposited many features of the old. Therefore, when we speak of the system of old or modern languages, we have in mind the historical form of the language with the greatest distinctness and stability in the majority of its features.

It must be said, however, that in this case we have a certain divergence from the living, colloquial speech. Definiteness and persistence are naturally determined by the actual language picture, but these dualities assume a special force in written form, in literature. Written fixation

is in itself a tool which brings definiteness and can assist stability. Definiteness and persistence function, moreover, not only in the sphere of a written language, but in the sphere of the colloquial, inasmuch as linguistic forms fixed in writing acquire the status of language models, of language standards.

We observe precisely such a picture in the history of the Japanese language in the eighth to fourteenth centuries. In the literary works of these centuries we may trace the great persistence of some forms and the slight persistence of others. A comparison of the language in works of an abstract nature with the language of works closer to common speech reveals in the latter the more frequent use of various linguistic forms. Thus, if one compares the language of the above-mentioned monument Tsurezuregusa with the language of the Kyōgen, the native farces of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, one finds in the language of these farces a series of elements which later became the norm of the new language. Inasmuch as the language of the farces beyond any doubt transmits the living speech of their time, such an observation enables us to conclude that there was a certain divergence between the language of the "great" literature of the fourteenth century and the purely colloquial language. This divergence consists in the fact that other forms were present in a colloquial language together with those forms which we see in the literature. Thus, for example, in the speech of the characters of the farces we find both different forms of the verb in the attributive and predicative positions as well as one and the same form in both these positions. But the possibility itself of unhindered use of either both forms or one form testifies to the fact that such forms did not constitute a barrier to understanding. So, in the language of "Tsurezuregusa" and similar literary works of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, we find the sum, so to speak, of the past development of the Japanese language - a sum represented in those forms which had survived the long tests of language use and acquired a stability which permitted them as an aggregate and in their interrelationships to form a distinct system.

This stability was determined by social practice, but literature and writing as a whole played a definite role in its creation.

As observations of the history of the Japanese language show, the language of literature can play a considerable role in establishing the

most appropriate and stable language forms if two conditions are present: if the language of this literature contains in itself all the most important language experience, and if this literature has during its existence a powerful and moreover progressive significance. The works in Japanese literature of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries of the type mentioned satisfy both these conditions.

If we compare the language of "Tsurezuregusa" with the language of "Genji Monogatari" - the famous novel of the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries, we see at once that they are not identical. The language of "Genji Monogatari" and other famous, so-called "Heian" novels of the ninth to eleventh centuries, is completely colloquial. Its grammatical system is the same as that in "Tsurezuregusa". The past tense of the verb is formed the same way, and has the same ending as it does in "Tsurezuregusa". The same situation exists throughout the morpology. However, in the area of syntax, in the sentence construction of "Tsurezuregusa", there is a tendency toward shorter syntactic constructions, and more economical means of expression. The differences in vocabulary are even more striking. On the whole, it is basically the same, but in "Tsurezuregusa" there are many words of Chinese origin, while in "Genji Monogatari" there are very few such words.

Facts of this sort indicate that the common language norms mentioned above were based on two different sources: purely colloquial and literary speech. We know the origins of this literary speech: the entire development in Japan from the eighth to the twelfth centuries was based on the study of Chinese literature - historical, legal, political and artistic.

We know also how this study was carried out: it was based on the translation and interpretation of various Chinese texts. In addition, efforts were made in translating to preserve almost all words of Chinese origin and to use a phrase structure as close to the Chinese as possible. In this connection, a special translator's jargon was created in the schools, which subsequently became one of the styles of the old literary language, and was called "the style for literal translation from the Chinese" ('kambun-chokuyakutai').

By degrees, more and more words from this Chinese literature crossed from special use to ordinary use, and entered the common language. With them, came also certain syntactic expressions. By the thirteenth century,

this originally literary stratum in the Japanese language occupied a noticeable place. Those features peculiar to the language of "Tsurezuregusa" as compared with the language of "Genji Monogatari", which we spoke of previously, belong to precisely this layer.

The lexical borrowings mentioned, which made it possible to develop in Japanese a socio-political, philosophical vocabulary, enriched the lexicon of the Japanese language. And naturally, this enrichment of the vocabulary showed itself most of all, not in the formally written novels, but in works like "Tsurezuregusa", namely in commentaries on all the possible themes of social life, in the exposition of views and thoughts on various ideological problems. For this reason, "Tsurezuregusa" is actually the sum of the development of the Japanese language up to that time.

The social significance of such works in the Japanese literature of the thirteenth to fourteenth centuries is beyond question. During these centuries, Japan was in a state of feudal dismemberment, when clashes between separate groups of feudal lords and peasant uprisings almost never ceased. This internal conflict reached special heights in the middle of the fourteenth century. Like "Tsurezuregusa", "Masu-kagami" belongs to precisely this period. "Masu-kagami" recounts the very events of these decades, "Tsurezuregusa" reveals the views, judgements, opinions, and tastes of the people of that time. From this standpoint "Tsurezuregusa" is a veritable art encyclopedia of the philosophical views and mental outlook of the most educated and reflective representatives of Japanese society of the fourteenth century.

These are the historical-linguistic, socio-historic and literary-artistic reasons which make it possible to see in the language of these works the literary language of medieval Japan. This is the historical model for the written-literary language of Japan in the contemporary and most recent period.

What was the historical model of the written-literary language of China of the new and latest period, of that language which is called wen-yen in China? We indicated above that this model was the language of the "eight great writers of T'ang and Sung", i.e. the language of the greatest writers of the eighth to twelfth centuries. What is the significance of the language of these works for their epoch and for the general history of the Chinese language?

We must first define the relationship of the language of the works of these T'ang and Sung writers to the living, colloquial language of their times.

As was indicated above, Han Yü, Liu Tsung-yüan, Su Shih and other literateurs of the pleiad of the "eight greats" were poets, journalists, and philosophers. Their prose we would call articles, essays, and treatises. Dialogue, which best of all renders the spoken language, is absent from them.

Their relationship to the colloquial language of that era may thus be established through comparison with other literary monuments where dialogue speech is present and, in general, the language carries the obvious stamp of colloquial elements. There are such monuments: the narrative literature of the eighth to the twelfth centuries, above all the so-called "T'ang novella".[27]

The novellas belonging to the T'ang period, i.e. to the seventh to tenth centuries, are constructed on plots taken from everyday life. In them we see people of the times and we hear their speech. A very famous novella is "The Story of Ying-ying" a short story about the love of two simple people.[28]

Its author is Yüan Chen. A friend of an eminent poet of the T'ang period, Po Chü-i (772-846), and of the brother of the latter, Po Hsin-chian (775-825), Yüan Chen was himself not only the author of novellas but a poet as well. We know that they all moved in one of the literary circles of the time. Such circles, friendly groups of writers, were numerous then in both capitals of the T'ang Empire, Ch'ang-an and Lo-yan. These circles were the most widespread form of literary social life. Po Hsin-chian was also a poet and an author of novellas. One of his best novels is "The Story of the Beautiful Li".[29]

There is no question but that the language of these novellas is the language of their authors, the language spoken by Po Hsin-chian and Yüan Chen and their literary friends, the language spoken by all writers, the representatives of the intelligentsia of medieval feudal China. They spoke the language spoken by the million inhabitants of the main T'ang capital, Ch'ang-an. This was the most common language of China at that time.

Comparing the language of these novellas with the language of the articles of the "eight greats" and taking into account differences evoked by the difference in genres, it is not difficult to discern that it is one and the same language. It is thuse possible to say that the language of the "eight greats" was not far removed from the living spoken elements of the time.

In the biography of Po Chü-i it is related how the poet seemingly decided on the publication of his poetry only after having read it to his own nurse and having convinced himself that she understood everything. Of course, such a story is just one of the anecdotes usually woven into the biographies of renowned writers, but it is nevertheless worthy of attention: the idea itself is interesting that the language of the writer should be checked against the language of the simple people. Such an idea must have some truth in it: the language of the poetry written by Po Chü-i was really the language of his times. And if this was the language of poetry, the language of prose was even closer to the spoken language. And all these writers, we repeat, belong to one and the same social strtum, the intelligentsia of a large city of medieval feudal China.

Several facts are very important for the characterization of the language of these writers. The first of these comes from the history of grammar, the second from the history of poetics. It is widely known that the science of grammar existed in old feudal China, having developed without the influence of any of the grammatical theories of the West. Several linguistic categories constituted the foundation of the grammatical system in this old science, the existence of which were noted by the old grammarians. At the beginning these were categories of "full signs" (shih-tz'ŭ) and "empty signs" (hsü-tz'ŭ). Inasmuch as the word in the eyes of these grammarians was always closely connected with the written sign, "sign" in these terms is to be understood as "word".

By "full" was understood a word which carries a definite referential and therefore independent meaning; by "empty" a word which does not have such a referential meaning. European Sinologists hold that the term "full word", corresponds to our "significant word", "empty word" to our "auxiliary word".

Such a division of words into two essentially different groups paved the way for the construction of the old Chinese grammatical system. Its essence lay in the fact that the significant words, entering into speech in specific interrelationships with one another, required auxiliary words; they required such words also in the case of a change in their meaning. Therefore, "empty words" meant all the grammatical elements of the language, and grammar was that reduced to the analysis of the function of these grammatical elements.

The study of the grammatical structure of the Chinese language was based in the main on the facts of the language of the T'ang and Sung writers. A chrestomathy of the selected works of these writers was, as we indicated above, the main text in school education. Moreover, the writers themselves of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries wrote, in the words of Lu Hsün, "if not reflecting Han Yü, then reflecting Su Shih". Thus, such a grammatical study reflects in itself the grammatical structure of the Chinese language of the eighth to twelfth centuries.

The very thoroughness of this old grammar and its obvious internal consistency and definitiveness could not have been obtained had the material itself not provided the data. We, approaching this material differently from the old Chinese grammarians, can only affirm the exceptional thoroughness and integrity of the language of the "eight greats" of the T'ang and Sung period.

It is also well known that all of Chinese classical poetry was based above all on the materials of the language of the T'ang and Sung writers. The poets of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries learned to write through the works of the T'ang poets; by studying the devices used by the T'ang and Sung writers in composing articles, treatises, and studies, the prose writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries learned how to construct compositions and studied the existing devices used in expository prose, plot development, colophons, etc. In short, by acquainting ourselves with the classical poetry of China, we in fact acquaint ourselves for the most part with what the Chinese investigators found in the T'ang and Sung authors.

These facts permit us to draw an essential conclusion: by virtue of its quality, the language of the "eight great" writers of the T'ang and Sung period early acquired the status of a grammatical and stylistic norm. We are therefore justified in seeing in it the literary language of China of the eighth to twelfth centuries. Thus, the historical model for the written-literary language of China of the new and latest periods was the literary language of medieval feudal China.

However, one essential addition must be made to what has already been said: in the language of the T'ang and Sung authors there are other elements as well. These may be traced to bookish sources.

Han Hü, journalist, and philosopher of the T'ang period, proclaimed a slogan which became the standard not only for his own activity, but the general rubric of the whole T'ang and Sung period, i.e. eighth to twelfth centuries. This slogan was a return to "the literature of antiquity" (ku-wen).

"The literature of antiquity" was for Han Yü and his followers the literature of China of the seventh to ninth centuries, B.C., which was indeed ancient even for them: Shih-ching ('The Book of Songs'), Shu-ching ('The Book of History') and other ancient monuments from which were later compiled the so-called "classical books" of Confucianism. Antiquity for the T'ang and Sung writers included the following centuries as well, when there lived the first great poet of China, Ch'ü Yüan (340-278 B.C.); "The Father of History" in China, Szu-ma Ch'ien (145-86 B.C.); and the greatest master of the "Poem in Prose", Szu-ma Hsiang-ju (179-118 B.C.). The works of these and several other writers of those centuries constituted for Han Yü and his colleagues "the literature of antiquity".[30]

Leaving aside for the moment the question of the historical significance of such a return to antiquity, we shall only point out here that as a result of this return, which was accompanied by an intensive study of ancient literature, the influence of the above-mentioned works of antiquity, i.e. of the language of an entirely different era, was reflected in the language of the T'ang and Sung writers.

Inasmuch as working out the history of the Chinese language, and especially of its grammatical structure, remains to this day an unfinished task of science, it is difficult for us to define the nature and degree of the grammatical differences between the language of ancient China and the language of medieval China. But, nevertheless, ob serving the traces of the ancient language in the language of the T'ang and Sung writers, we see that many of the constructions of the ancient language were easily placed within the framework of the medieval language. On the other hand, a study of the grammatical treatises of older and newer Chinese authors who were devoted to the written-literary language (wen-yen) shows that examples from the ancient written monuments are widely used in them. It is thus impossible to suggest a serious isolation of the literary languages of ancient and medieval China, although in many respects this ancient language differed from the medieval and was for the Chinese of the T'ang and Sung period

the language of the ancient literature. We therefore can consider those elements which entered the language of the T'ang and Sung writers from the ancient language to be elements from a literary source.

However, the facility with which elements entered the language of the eighth to twelfth centuries testifies to the fact that the T'ang and Sung writers took from the ancient language precisely those features which preserved their significance for later times: in other words, those features upon which the general direction of the development of the language was based. We may thus consider the language of the writers of the T'ang and Sung periods a kind of result of the development and standardization of the most persistent and vital elements of the Chinese language. One cannot fail to see in this one of the reasons why this language became the literary norm and acquired the status of the literary language of medieval China.

For a full understanding of the essence of this literary language it is necessary however to take into consideration still one more circumstance, namely: a certain divergence between it and the purely spoken language of the period. Of this we are convinced when we compare the works of the T'ang and Sung authors, even those such as, for example, the novellas which were closest to the colloquial language, with the so-called "anthologies of utterances" (yü-lu) and "booklets of stories" (hua-pen) of the Sung period (tenth to twelfth centuries).

In the language of these monuments of so-called "popular literature" there are a number of features absent from the language of the above-mentioned writers.

We are well aware that a new period in the history of the Chinese langua ge begins approximately in the thirteenth century, the final stage of which is the contemporary Chinese national language. This period is connected with the development of the so-called "folk literature": folk-song poetry, stories, and dramas. All the Chinese novels and plays which later became famous appeared after the thirteenth century. And their characteristic feature from the linguistic point of view was the fact that they were all written in pai-hua, i.e. in the colloquial language of the time.

If one takes this new Chinese language, as it may conveniently be termed, in the latest stage of its development, then its most essential grammatical difference from the medieval language is, as we see it, the following.

We indicated above that grammatical teaching of the medieval language was based on the opposition of two linguistic categories: "full words" and "empty words". Grammatical teaching of the new period had to depart from this: instead of two main categories in the language, three were observed. Two of these were named by the former terms, shih-tz'ŭ and hsü-tz'ŭ; the third by a new term: chu-tz'ŭ.[31]

However, these former terms received a new meaning. The word shih in the term shih-tz'ŭ has the meanings 'full' and 'real'; the word hsü in the term hsü-tz'ŭ means 'empty' and 'absent from reality'. Corresponding to these second meanings, the term shih-tz'ŭ began to be understood as 'words designating objects', hsü-tz'ŭ as 'words designating actions and properties of objects'. Such a concept is connected with the old Chinese grammarians' conception that existence is characteristic only of an object; as far as actions or properties are concerned, they have no separate existence apart from an object.[32]

But a grammatical observation was hidden behind this explanation: it was noticed that the appearance of a hsü-tz'ŭ, i.e. an "auxiliary word" in the former sense of the term, depended upon the word which was, so to speak, served by that word. In other words, auxiliary elements were observed which were connected with the category of noun and auxiliary elements connected with the categories of action and quality. And this meant that the former general grammatical category "significant words" split into two special categories: a noun group, and a predicative group where everything was included which later in turn split into verbs and adjectives. Such a split was connected with the strengthening of special morphological features for these categories not only relating to analytic morphology but also belonging to synthetic morphology.

Such a grammatical study, naturally, could not have appeared were it not for the linguistic facts supporting it. And these facts were new by comparison with the language of the T'ang and Sung authors.

The above, we repeat, concerns the Chinese language of the later period; in the Sung folk tales and collections of utterances such facts were not yet fully confirmed and co-existed with facts present in the language of T'ang and Sung writers. For this reason, they did not constitute any barrier to understanding. Moreover the language of the Sung folk tales belonged to the spoken language of that time and the above-mentioned elements

were, as a consequence, characteristic only of that sphere of the language. But it must nevertheless be recognized that the literary language of medieval China, represented by the T'ang novella and the works of the "eight greats", included only the most stable, cultivated, and socially justified linguistic norms, i.e. it was precisely what we call a literary language.

Such is the historical model for the written-literary language of China of the new and latest periods. It must be noted that the meaning of such a model for the medieval Chinese literary language resulted from the well-known significance of the literature of its representatives. We indicated above that Han Yü proclaimed the slogan of a return to "literary antiquity". This slogan became the standard for a whole great epoch, encompassing the eighth to eleventh centuries. The old classics began to be revived from oblivion, to be republished, studied, and commented upon. They were quoted at every step. Opinions and conceptions were supported by them. There began a veritable rebirth of antiquity.

What attracted one to this antiquity? What did the philosophers, journalists and poets of the eighth and succeeding centuries seek in the works of the seventh to second centuries B.C.? The answer is given by the one who first called for a return to antiquity -- Han Yü: in them were sought that humanism which the T'ang and Sung writers and thinkers strove to make the content of their epoch.

Han Yü in his small treatise called "On Man" was the first to proclaim that man is the highest value of all being, that in him all being is concentrated. "Heaven" for him was only "the sun, the moon, the planets, and the stars"; "Earth" for him was only "grass, trees, mountains, and rivers". And everything in between -- everything living, alive, acting -- was concentrated in man. In his other treatise "On the Way" Han Yü formulated the second tenet of Chinese humanism of the eighth century. This tenet is "universal love", i.e. love for everything. Such a love for everything, in the conception of Han Yü, should be the basis for all social life and its progressive development.[33]

Such ideas were new for the medieval China of that time and signaled a great step forward. What they led to in creative writing is shown by the poetry of Po Chü-i, which was thoroughly imbued with such humanism. This humanism also determined the enormous social significance of the works of the T'ang and Sung authors, a significance far transcending the boundaries

of their epoch. The significance of the language of their works, the literary language of medieval China, was thereby enhanced.

We hope that this exposition has revealed the essence of that phenomenon which is called wen-yen in contemporary China and bungo in Japan, i.e. the written-literary language. Why did it evoke passionate protests and in the end was forced to leave the scene?

The answer to this question, we suggest, is clear: this language proved to be unfit for the people of the newest epoch. Above all, it proved to be unfit because it had already become obsolete. And it had become obsolete in all its most important elements: in both its vocabulary and grammatical structure. From a literary language, it had turned into a written-literary language.

We have already broadly outlined the direction taken by the development of the Chinese and Japanese language of the new period. The grammatical structure acquired new features; new words flooded the language. The problem, it would seem, might have been easily solved: begin to write as one spoke. But two obstacles arose on this path: the insufficient development of pai-hua in China and kōgo in Japan and certain features of the social structure.

Literature written in the language of the new period began to develop in China from the thirteenth century, and by the end of the nineteenth century it constituted a large collection of novels, stories and plays. But the ruling class of feudal China firmly held all the other branches of writing in its hands. Thus, laws, political and economic treatises, philosophical essays, i.e. all "serious" literature, had to be written in the language of the "classics". Even "high" poetry and artistic prose did not have the right to descend to the level of "simple language", the vernacular. The old literary language was thereby called upon to support Chinese feudalism. This explains why the struggle for a new China drew even language into its orbit.

The same circumstances long retained the old literary language also in Japan. It too had become obsolete for people of the new period, had ceased to be understandable. From a literary language it turned into a written-literary language. During the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries, the last period of Japanese feudalism, an enormous urban literature grew up in Japan

using, for the most part, the live spoken language of the time. In this language were written novels, stories, and to a lesser degree theatrical pieces. In this language the vast domain of the oral story grew, an extremely popular vaudeville genre among the people. As in China, however, the colloquial language, as a "vernacular", was not permitted in those branches of writing which were controlled by the ruling class of feudal lords. For this reason, the text of the law, treatises on economics, politics, philosophy, if they were all not written in Chinese were written in the old literary language. This old language became one of the instruments for the monopolization of enlightenment and of education by the ruling class; the ruling class closely associated it with themselves. It is understandable after this, that when the bourgeois revolution took place in Japan in 1868, incomplete, it is true, but nevertheless, leading the country in the direction of capitalist development, the struggle with the remains of feudalism, which was led by the young and still radically inclined bourgeoisie, included among its targets the old literary language, which had long since become, as we said above, the written-literary language. But the reactionary block of the bourgeoisie and land owners became the foundation of power in capitalist Japan, and that fact caused both the indecisiveness of the position of the bourgeoisie, who quickly shed their original radicalism, and the stubbornness of the ruling classes with respect to the defense of the written-literary language. We have outlined above how long this language was retained in official use. Only the pressure of the democratic masses after the defeat of Japanese reaction in the Second World War forced the ruling class to surrender its position even in this language domain -- the last which this class still held in its hands.

The development of the system of the new language, fully revealed in Japan from the end of the sixteenth century on, led to the existence of a completely developed standard both in the domain of lexicon as well as in the sphere of grammar at the end of the nineteenth century. Thus, conditions already existed for the formation of the new literary language. Such a language indeed exists in Japan. It is called "model" (Hyōjungo).

Stable norms, which laid the foundation also for the formation of the new literary language, were formed during the long period of development of the new language of China. The preparation process went so far as to permit Lu Hsün, the founder of modern Chinese literature, to create works

establishing this new literary language as early as the end of the second decade of the twentieth century. It was called pai-hua in China, i.e. by the same word which had earlier meant 'colloquial language' and even 'vernacular'; at the present time the term p'u-t'ung-hua 'ordinary language' is accepted. Such a transfer of the term underlines, as it were, the unity of the linguistic sphere of the modern literary and colloquial languages.

From the above we may draw, it seems to us, the following conclusions:

1) A literary language should be understood as an aggregate of those linguistic norms which are the most highly developed and tested by social usage, the most stable and socially acceptable, those norms which define the phonetic system of a given language, its lexical system, and its system of grammar and stylistics.

2) In the general history of the language of any people, the literary language, thus understood, appears in different historical forms, which arise at each major stage in the history of that people, a stage associated with great changes in the general structure of the language. Such historical forms may be termed the literary language of such an era.

3) The appearance of different historical forms of a literary language at any stage in the history of the language of a given people is accompanied by the historical development of that people, particularly with the stage of nationality formation and development and the stage of national formation and development. As history shows, the formation and development of nationality is connected with the feudal stage of socio-economic development and the national formation of a people, the formation and development of a nation is connected with the capitalist stage. Correspondingly, one may speak of a medieval literary language and a modern literary language.

4) A medieval literary language and a modern literary language are different with respect to the scope of their utilization and, consequently, with respect to the degree of their social significance. In the former case, the social significance of the literary language is limited to definite, relatively narrow social strata, for the most part the ruling classes; in the latter case, the literary language acquires great, almost nation-wide significance. The more decisive the process of democratization, the more effective this significance becomes.

5) In connection with this, the historical fate of these literary languages is different as well. A medieval literary language, restricted primarily to the use of the dominating class, gradually codifies its forms and thus begins to fall away from the general linguistic development of the language of a given people. On this basis a rift between the literary language and the language of actual speech takes place in the end, and the literary language becomes a written-literary language, as opposed to the colloquial language. A modern literary language, also codifying its forms to a certain extent, but, nevertheless, being by nature closely connected with the entire language sphere (with the nation-wide language), follows the general development of the language, constantly absorbing the most established and stable innovations, appearing in the language usage of the nation. Thus, the modern literary language does not lose contact with the living language and does not turn into a written-literary language.

6) The rift between the medieval literary language and the language of living usage later leads to the dissatisfaction of the new generations with the expression by means of the literary language of new ideas and thoughts, created by a new era. On the strength of this there arises a certain antagonism, between the old literary language and the new.

7) For its final development, a literary language needs written codification, a literature. We are therefore right in speaking of a literary language only if such literature exists.

8) The importance of a literary language as a definite linguistic norm is supported by the social significance of the literature in which the literary language is codified.

9) Inasmuch as the social significance of a given literature may change with a change in historical circumstances, the social attitude toward the literary language codified in that literature also changes: with the transition to a new stage of social development, the literary language, connected with the literature which is characteristic of the passing stage, is interpreted as unacceptable to the new social development.

10) The antagonistic opposition of the old and new literary languages in the social consciousness cannot long persist. Besides the general historical continuity which connects the new literary language with the old, the new literary language in its development must also in practice turn to the old, utilizing everything in it that is viable.

FOOTNOTES

1. Mao Tse-tung, Vol. 4, M., IL, 1953, p. 92.
2. Speech on the theme "Wu-sheng-te Chung-kuo" ('Silent China'), delivered in Hong Kong on February 16, 1927. Cf. Lu Hsün. Chuan-chi ('Collected Works'), Vol. IV. Peking, 1957, p. 25 (in Chinese).
3. Ibid.
4. Lu Hsün. Chuan-chi, Vol. IV, p. 24.
5. Ibid.
6. Cf. V.I. Lenin. Tetradi po imperializmu ('Notebooks on Imperialism'), M., 1939, pp. 622, 623.
7. For example in the work "Chung-kuo ko-ming yü Chung-kuo Kung-ch'an-tang", 1939 (cf. Mao Tse-Tung. Hsüan-chi ('Selected Works'). Harbin, 1948, p. 214 (in Chinese).
8. On this point see the works on the history of the Japanese language which have recently appeared in Japan, for example, Yuzawa Kokichiro. Kokugosi gaisetsu. 1943, pp. 10, 11; also the majority of the general works on the Japanese language, for example, Kobayashi Yoshiharu. Kokugogaku Tsūran. 1944, p. 371.
9. "...approximately four fifths of all the Chinese people speak so-called Kuan-hua, or the Mandarin dialect" (P.P. Schmidt. Opyt mandarinskoj grammatiki s tekstami dlja upražnenij. Posobie dlja izučenija razgovornogo kitajskogo jazyka Pekinskogo narečija ('Mandarin Grammar with Exercises. Text for the Study of Colloquial Chinese of the Peking Variety'), 2nd ed., Vladivostok, 1915, p. 14).

   The general significance of kuan-hua and, moreover, of the northern variety, i.e. the variety based on the Peking dialect, is testified to the fact that it was precisely this which all Europeans began to study first, naturally striving to master the language variety with the widest distribution. Furthermore, it is precisely this significance of kuan-hua which is reflected in the titles of reference works compiled by Western European Sinologists. J. Edkins, who wrote a Chinese grammar as far back as 1857, made a special point of indicating that he was writing a grammar of the spoken language, "usually called the Mandarin dialect" (J. Edkins. A grammar of Chinese Colloquial language commonly called the Mandarin Dialect. Shanghai, 1857). A new, improved edition

with the same title appeared in Shanghai in 1864. The German Sinologist Carl Arendt, who published his famous Chinese textbook in Germany in 1891, also wrote a grammar of northern kuan-hua, calling it "A Textbook of the Spoken Language" (C. Arendt. Handbuch der nordchinesische Umgangssprache. 1891; Einführung in die nordchinesische Umgangssprache. Stuttgart-Berlin, 1894). Kuan-hua is called the spoken language by M. Courant as well, the author of a popular French textbook on the Chinese language (M. Courant. La langue chinoise parlée. Grammaire du Kwan-hua septentrional. 1913).

10. For details cf. Hashimoto Shinkichi. Kokugogaku gairon (in the series Iwanami Nippon bungaku Kōza); Andō Masatsugu. Kokugo hattatsusi josetsu (in the series Kokugogaku Kōza).
11. The opinion of I.M. Ošanin, expressed in its original form in 1946 and affirmed by him in a report read in the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences in June 1951.
12. Here the term koiné is applied to a common language, formed on the basis of and within the framework of a specific group of dialects, in other words, in the sense of a local common language. The formation of such local common languages is testified to by the appearance of a special designation for them: they too were called kuan-hua. Inasmuch as the word kuan-hua implies the notion "common language", it is possible to speak of common languages of various regions. One sometimes finds the name kuan-hua applied to a local koiné in the works of European Sinologists, for example: K. Nemeling. The Nankin Kuan Hua. Göttingen, 1907. Concerning these koiné, cf. the above-mentioned work by P.P. Schmidt Opyt mandarinskoj grammatiki..., the introductory part: "Lingvističeskoe vvedenie v izučenie kitajskogo jazyka" ('A Linguistic Introduction to the Study of the Chinese Language'). Here too are general remarks concerning the formation of northern Kuan-hua.
13. Yuzawa directly indicates that the kyōgen language is close to the common national language of the Muromati period (second half of the fourteenth century to the end of the sixteenth); cf. Kokugosi gaisetsu, p. 8.
14. The social sciences in Japan of the 1870's and 1880's were the economic, political, and social teachings of Mill and Spenser, as well as

Montesquieu and Rousseau. Cf. N.I. Konrad. "Pervyj étap japonskoj buržuaznoj literatury. ('The First Stage of Japanese Bourgeois Literature')" In Problemy literatury Vostoka, ('Problems of Oriental Literature'), 1st ed., L., 1932.

In China until the end of the 1920's, as writes Mao Tse-tung, "the evolutionary theory of Darwin, the formal logic of Mill, French educational literature, and the social history of Montesquieu" were widely disseminated. (Mao Tse-tung. Hsüan-chi, p. 236).

15. Cf. Mao Tse-tung. Hsüan-chi, p. 263.
16. J. Stalin. Marksizm i voprosy jazykoznanija ('Marxism and Problems of Linguistics'). M. Gospolitizdat, 1954, p. 13.
17. Mao Tse-tung. "On the Movement of the Fourth of May" (an article in a collection devoted to the thirtieth anniversary of the movement). 1949, p. 4 (in Chinese).
18. Cf. Mao Tse-tung. Hsüan-chi, p. 956.
19. Shimazaki Tōson. Narušennyj zavet ('The Broken Precept'). Novel. Authorized translation from the Japanese by N. Fel'dman. Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, pp. 3, 4. The introduction was printed in Japanese in the journal Meiji bungaku kenkyū, March, 1934, pp. 30, 31.
20. Cf. the articles concerning problems of language reform in the journal Nippon Hyōron, June, 1946.
21. Mao Tse-tung. "On the Movement of the Fourth of May", p. 7.
22. The example is taken from the "Chrestomathy" of 1907-1908. Cf. D. Pozdneeve. Tokuhon ili kniga dlja čtenija i praktičeskix upražnenij v japonskom jazyke, ('Book for Reading and Practical Exercises in the Japanese Language'), Part 2, Books V-VIII. Yokohama, 1908, p. 145.
23. The example is taken from the chrestomathy Gendaibun Yōkai. Tokyo, 1927, pp. 94, 95.
24. The example is taken from the chrestomathy Kuo-wen tu-pen, Book 2, Shanghai, 1930, pp. 4, 5.
25. The chrestomathy Kuo-wen tu-pen, Book 2, p. 33.
26. See the speech on the theme "Silent China", delivered in Hong Kong on February 16, 1927 (Lu Hsün. Chuan-chi, Vol. IV, p. 24).
27. Tanskie novelly (T'ang Novellas). Translated from the Chinese with an afterword and notes by O.L. Fišman. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR, 1955.

28. For a Russian translation, cf. the above-mentioned collection Tanskie novelly, pp. 136-148.

29. In B.A. Vasil'ev's translation cf. Po Hsin-chian. "Povest' o prekrasnoj Li ('Tale of the Beautiful Li')" "Vostok", Collection 1, "Literatura Kitaja i Japonii ('Literature of China and Japan')", Moscow, "Academia", 1935, pp. 139-162; in O.L. Fišman's translation, "Provest' o krasavice Li", cf. Tanskie novelly, pp. 90-145.

30. For details cf. N.I. Konrad. "Načalo kitajskogo gumanizma ('The Beginning of Chinese Humanism')". "Sovetskoe vostokovedenie", No. 3, 1957.

31. Cf., for example, the special treatise on these "auxiliary words", "Chu yü tz'u", by Lu I-wei (last quarter of the sixteenth century and the first quarter of the seventeenth century).

32. Cf. the Chinese grammar Bumpōsyo by Hozumi Ikan, a Japanese Sinologist of the second half of the eighteenth century.

33. Cf. N.I. Konrad. "Načalo kitajskogo gumanizma", pp. 73, 74.